

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,773  
Docket No.: 8615-US-PA-1

### REMARKS

#### Present Status of the Application

It is noted with great appreciation that the Examiner indicated Claims 7-9 are allowable over prior art of record.

Claims 1-9 are pending of which claims 1 and 4 have been amended for more explicitly describing the claimed invention. It is believed that no new matter adds by way of amendments made to claims or otherwise to the application. For at least the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-9 patently define over prior art of record and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

#### Discussion of the claim rejection under 37 CFR 1.126

*The Office Action objected to the specification because the numbering of the claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution, and the Examiner has renumbered the misnumbered claims 5-7 and 13-18 as 1-9, respectively.*

In response thereto, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for pointing out the informality and also for rectifying the informality by renumbering the claims.

#### Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 102

*The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Ozaki et al. (US-2002/0131010, hereinafter Ozaki).*

Applicant respectfully disagrees and would like to point out that rejection of

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,773  
Docket No.: 8615-US-PA-1

Claim(s) under 35 U.S.C. 102 requires that each and every elements of the claims(s) must be disclosed exactly by a single prior art reference.

Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amended independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that Ozaki substantially fails to disclose every feature of independent claims 1 and 4. More specifically, Ozaki fails to teach or disclose a repairing method for repairing a pixel structure comprising at least a step of providing a pixel structure comprising at least a thin film transistor, a pixel electrode, a scan line, a data distributing line and a repairing conductive line underneath the data distributing line ....as required by the proposed independent claims 1 and 4.

Instead, Ozaki substantially discloses, in FIG. 10, page 6, paragraphs [0078]-[0079], a method of repairing a storage capacitor bus line (115) comprising the steps of forming contact openings 154 for exposing portions of the storage capacitor bus line (115) at the both end portions of the storage capacitor bus line (115) and then forming a repairing conductive film (156) to electrically connect the defective disconnected storage capacitor bus line (115). In other words, the storage capacitor bus line (115) of Ozaki is not equivalent to the [repairing] conductive line of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Ozaki cannot meet claims 1 and 4 in this regard.

Furthermore, Ozaki substantially fails to teach or disclose at least the steps of "forming a first opening and a second opening in the first dielectric layer and the second dielectric layer above the repair sections of the repairing conductive line so that a portion of the data distributing line and the respective repair sections of the repairing conductive line are exposed", as required by the amended Claim 1.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,773  
Docket No.: 8615-US-PA-1

Instead, Ozaki substantially discloses, in FIG. 10, page 6, paragraphs [0078]-[0079], that one of the contact openings (154) exposes a portion of an end portion of the storage capacitor bus line (115), and the other contact opening (154) exposes only a portion another end portion of the defective storage capacitor bus line (115). In other words, Ozaki substantially fails to teach or disclose both the contact openings (115) exposes a portion of drain bus line (101). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Ozaki fails to disclose every elements of Claim 1 in this regard.

For at least the above reasons, it is therefore submitted that claims 1-6 patently define over Ozaki and therefore claims 1-6 should be allowed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,773  
Docket No.: 8615-US-PA-1

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-9 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted

Date : *Sept. 30, 2004*

*Belinda Lee*  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: belinda@jciipgroup.com.tw; usa@jciipgroup.com.tw